

---

**From:** Brooks, George P CIV  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 28, 2017 8:21 AM  
**To:** Henderson, Kim/SDO; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Macchiarella, Thomas L JR CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N  
**Cc:** Witmer, Michael/VBO; Scott Hay (shay@cabreraservices.com); Sykes, Kira/PDX  
**Subject:** RE: For Review: Parcels B and G Report  
**Attachments:** Draft HPNS Report\_Parcels B and G Soil\_092717 pb edits Rev2.docx

Revision 2 after a discussion with Derek and Thomas. Please use this version.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brooks, George P CIV  
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 7:27 AM  
To: 'Henderson, Kim/SDO'; Janda, Danielle L CIV; Macchiarella, Thomas L JR CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N  
Cc: Witmer, Michael/VBO; Scott Hay (shay@cabreraservices.com); Sykes, Kira/PDX  
Subject: RE: For Review: Parcels B and G Report

Minor corrections in Sections 1 and 2. In track changes and highlighted in green.

-----Original Message-----

From: Henderson, Kim/SDO [mailto:Kimberly.Henderson@CH2M.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2017 4:38 PM  
To: Janda, Danielle L CIV; Macchiarella, Thomas L JR CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Brooks, George P CIV; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N  
Cc: Witmer, Michael/VBO; Scott Hay (shay@cabreraservices.com); Sykes, Kira/PDX  
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] For Review: Parcels B and G Report  
Importance: High

Hi All-

Your comments were addressed in redline in the attached text (and are being addressed in forms and figures) except a few notes/responses on those listed below by name. Please let us know ASAP if you want to talk through these further or if any other changes are needed.

Thanks,

Kim

Danielle,

For your general comment, where we are recommending additional action (reanalysis of archived samples or confirmation sampling), we are indicating that there is evidence for falsification or manipulation on the forms and in the reports, including for those where there was the potential for avoiding hotspots.

For your comment in the Executive Summary footnote, there were other comments to revise/redline so see if this is better.

For the comment on page 4-1, we left as footnote since it doesn't really fit in the background section.

For the comment on Section 4, the 7th paragraph of Section 2.1 explains the difference between an excavated soil unit and overburden soil.

Thomas,

For your 1st comment, that header was provided by Pat, assuming it was from legal.

The # of building sites has changed overtime. There are 27 current and former building sites being evaluated as of my list right now (5 in B, 2 in G, and 20 in E).

For the COCs, we are still working on the inventory (should be done within the next week) and need that completed to fully evaluate them (e.g., compare signatures for all). Once completed, we can add the results into the next version of the report.

Pat,

In the Executive Summary and Section 1 objectives text, your changes were different, we just went with your edits for the most part. Also, the addition of this text "The evaluation is subdivided by parcel and the type of survey unit being addressed. The first fieldwork performed by TtEC occurred in Parcel B. Fieldwork performed by TtEC in Parcel B was from 2005 through 2010 and Parcel G was from 2002 through 2011. Three types of survey units were considered." is repetitive so it was not added.

In the Executive Summary and Section 2.5, we added the list but ideally the list of allegations should be more in-line with our evaluation process (to show that our evaluation addressed them where possible) but do not have time before Friday to look into this and revise language.

Please look at and response to Matt's comment on Section 3 in the "Sites Based on Allegations" bullet.

In Section 4.2.3, for your comment "Yes, but the text is not consistent with the other SUs.", do you mean because we streamlined the following subsections? Please advise.

For the added text in Section 4 right after the bullet that says, "Physical Inspection of Archived Samples....", we added it but placement seems odd and this was not part of our evaluation findings and recommendations. Consider moving or deleting?

Conclusions and recommendations - We deleted a bit of text a revised a bit.

Matt,

For Figure 3-2, we only included the buildings/sites that could impact the sewers and the soils in areas where TtEC could have falsified data. There are lots of impacted buildings that TtEC wasn't involved with and didn't impact the sewers that we haven't looked at. We clarified this in the text in Section 3 Data Evaluation Activities under the Historically Significant Sites bullet and will QC and revise the figure if needed.

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)